

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion

The Great Conflict of Opinion

There is a deep division of opinion about foreign policy in relation to the Cold War, and the debate will continue for a long time. The bitter polemics about the Cleveland conference are one symptom of this division in the American churches. Such molders of opinion as Walter Lippmann and David Lawrence give us totally different pictures of the world.

Basically the same difference appears between the Government of Britain on the one hand and those of Germany and France on the other. Our own Government is not sure where it stands, and there are some intimations that it seeks to avoid a decision in favor of either of the extreme blocs of opinion. More fundamental than the particular issues created by each day's events are at least two questions that cause thoughtful people to take different positions on the concrete problems of policy.

The first is the question of whether we should see the problem of our relations with Russia almost entirely in ideological terms. One extreme expression in these terms is a column by Philip Burnham in *The Commonweal* (May 1) objecting to the very idea of a summit conference. He says: "A conference necessarily implies a certain likeness, or equivalence, among the participants, but when the equivalence is carelessly or falsely transferred all in all, the effect is to distort opinion and destroy so much the more of the world's determination to prevent the Communist empire."

Compare this attitude with Senator Fulbright's suggestion that we have regular summit conferences on the grounds that we must live with the Russians whether we want to or not. The Fulbright position is the sounder position, for we should look

at Russia as a great nation with pride of achievement, national interests and fears that are, to some extent, independent of the fact that it is a Communist nation.

For example, no Russian government—Communist or non-Communist—could accept the unification of Germany as an ally of the West and armed with nuclear weapons. Macmillan and his party came back from Russia convinced that the Russians were really afraid of the location of nuclear weapons in Germany. Those who take the opposite view of these matters are inclined to think that since communism is evil, these fears of a Communist government are not to be taken seriously. This problem of national security against nuclear war is of common interest to both sides.

Also, Russia, as an advanced Communist nation, is affected by history in ways that may not be anticipated by the ideology. The desire of the Russian people for a better standard of living may prove to be stronger than the ideology. Adlai Stevenson's comment—that the Russian desires two things: peace and an apartment—says a great deal about the natural concerns that do influence the Government. This is not to deny that ideology is important both as a source of motive and in providing a distorted picture of the outside world. (Incidentally, great credit should go to Mr. Dulles for not thinking of Yugoslavia and Poland in exclusively ideological terms.)

There is another factor that makes for the difference of opinion dividing the West at this time. It may be put this way. All of us agree that Western policies should be designed to prevent the extension of Communist power and to prevent a

Vol. XIX, No. 8, May 11, 1959 \$5.00 per year; 25 cents a copy

third world war. No one with any authority among us would renounce either objective. But until recently, it has not been necessary to think very hard about the relationship between those objectives. It has been possible to assume that both objectives could be served by the same policies and operations. Since the Communist nations were clearly the only potential aggressors, if we could deter them from aggression, we would at one and the same time stop communism and prevent war. It was very easy for our leaders to suggest that any build-up of military power on our side was in the interests of peace.

But now a difference appears between the two approaches to this subject. There are still those who are convinced that the two objectives can be served by the same policies and operations, that no special thought has to be given to the prevention of war as a separate problem. But there are others who have had to change their views on this subject. The present type of deterrent is becoming too provocative. With the two great armed powers perpetually mobilized with decisive striking power, there is danger that a combination of miscalculation and panic might start the ultimate war. Or a limited war might, without anyone's intending it, become an all-out war under these conditions.

If these things are true, it is a mistake to assume that we can serve our two major objectives by means of the same policies and operations. It is not enough to concentrate on the containing of communism, believing that peace will be a by-product of this effort. No, we have to put brains, energy and imagination into the specific task of reducing the provocations that go with our power, into the effort to reduce tensions, into the problem of scaling down nuclear arms. Even if it is difficult to foresee success in concrete terms as a result of these efforts, they should claim both our thought and our dedication.

It is disappointing that the initiative of Prime Minister Macmillan seems now to be overshadowed by the intransigence of Germany and France, for Macmillan, of all the great statesmen in the West, sees most clearly that the task of preventing war is a task that calls for its own policies and operations. Many of our own leaders have come to see this, including some of the stronger voices in the Senate, and it is to be hoped that they will influence our policy, which seems still to be fluid.

Quite apart from the events of the immediate future, these basic sources of differences in attitude

and opinion should be noted. We agree with those who refuse to see the behavior of great nations exclusively in ideological terms. It is insufficient to trust to the balance of terror to keep the peace; continuous initiatives are called for to reduce particular tensions and causes of provocation and to begin to bring the nuclear arms race under control.

J. C. B.

PREMIER CASTRO AND CUBA

IN RECENT DAYS, the United States has been treated to a one-man show of unusual proportions by the visit of Fidel Castro. Dressed in his olive drab fatigue uniform, with a cigar protruding through his full beard, he has been the bane of perspiring policemen and security agents assigned to protect him as he rushed into the crowds gathered to greet him.

Understanding growing from the trip must not prevent us or Dr. Castro from facing the serious state of affairs itself in Cuba. Although high officials responsible for Cuban fiscal policy deny that the situation is serious, U.S. Government economists have warned that Cuba's gold and dollar reserves will reach the vanishing point late this summer. This is not prompted by irresponsible actions of the revolutionary regime since economic matters had reached a critical stage under President Batista by late 1958.

Under more normal conditions an austerity program coupled with and reinforced by U.S. aid would appear to offer the most hope for carrying through Dr. Castro's program of industrial diversification, land reform and housing. However, a strong program of austerity would likely, at least temporarily, increase the number of unemployed—which is already 700,000 in a population of 6,000,000—and raise prices, thereby endangering the Government.

Furthermore, as Herbert L. Matthews recently observed in *The New York Times*, "inflexible financial orthodoxy demands too much of an underdeveloped Latin America country without enough experienced government officials, or managers and technicians in the industrial structure, or workers with a well-developed union movement and a philosophy of high productivity." For this reason our economic policy must be adapted to the realities of the life and politics of Cuba. Apparently this realization is growing in Washington.

It is not presently clear, however, that either Dr. Castro or the United States is ready to enter into an agreement. If necessary we should take the initiative; we obviously cannot sit back and watch the Castro regime "go through the wringer" unless we are willing to see Cuba ruled by extremists of the Left or Right. Dr. Castro is fortunate to have several outstanding and experienced economists for advisers. It would be foolhardy for him not to rely on their judgment.

Premier Castro, on the whole, represents the ideals and aspirations of his people, however ill-defined they may be. He won their devotion by brave and courageous leadership that overthrew a brutal, tyrannical dictatorship. Now he is cast in a new, more demanding role—civil leadership and executive responsibility—that has baffled military heroes in political life throughout history.

Many serious problems have arisen that cannot be dealt with by the broad generalities in which the Premier tends to speak. Clarification and, at certain points, reform of the rebel criminal code are clearly called for. Executions of those members of the Batista tyranny found guilty of torture and killing were both approved and demanded by the people early this year. Further executions beyond these are now feared as a part of the familiar pattern of eliminating enemies of the regime.

Meanwhile the Communists are moving swiftly to exploit all possible connections with the revolution. Their newspaper, *Hoy*, reappeared shortly after Batista fled and has gained a wide circulation. At the same time, unions and some other groups were taken over by the Communists, whose influence is seen in new demands on industry. Moving professionally, they are organizing the towns and villages despite the amateurish efforts of the 26th of July movement to combat them.

These problems, plus the question of elections and a growing dissatisfaction in the middle class which most supported the revolution, indicate that Dr. Castro has his job cut out for him. His failure to better attend to these matters during the last few months are cause for concern over Cuba's future. We hope his will to tackle this task is as strong as was the will that overthrew Batista. Otherwise, the belief of the people of Cuba in a free society could be destroyed.

W. H. C.

THE IMAGE OF PROTESTANTISM

HARPER'S has finally run its series of articles on modern religious beliefs: one by a "heretic," one by a Jew and one by a Roman Catholic. For reasons best known to themselves, the editors

have concluded the series with an article by William W. Bartley, III, entitled "I Call Myself a Protestant." The article is an interesting, highly subjective account of a "modern man's" pilgrimage from the faith of his fathers to an uneasy resting place within the Society of Friends.

There are many questions that could be raised about the article as such. Mr. Bartley's thesis seems to be that if a Protestant believes anything resembling the traditional faith he is a fool, while if he doesn't believe everything in a traditional sense he is a knave. He indulges in arrogantly adolescent dismissals of such men as Niebuhr, Tillich and Barth. "The intellectual shoddiness of Tillich's system" is a characteristic phrase, and Niebuhr is caricatured as demanding that we "reject the hard thinking of three centuries in order to embrace his particular interpretation of the 'Word of God.'"

But the real question does not concern Mr. Bartley's right to make these statements if he so chooses. The real question concerns *Harper's* right to publish Mr. Bartley's odyssey as the article in its series designed to represent a Protestant voice. The Catholic, Jewish and "heretical" voices were recognizably commensurate with their respective traditions. And despite the editors' disclaimers, Mr. Bartley's voice will be interpreted as "representative" of contemporary Protestantism.

Mr. Bartley speaks for a few Protestants, but he clearly speaks for no more than a few. *Harper's* has thus helped to perpetrate a false image of Protestantism as sheer individualism generated out of negative protest.

R. M. B.

To Our Subscribers

The continuing spiral of costs has made it necessary to increase the subscription price to \$5.00 per year. The Editorial Board resisted this increase as long as possible and has taken this step with extreme reluctance.

Printing costs have continued to advance, and recent Federal legislation has also raised postal rates. Writers appearing in the journal receive no honoraria for their articles; only the production staff is on salary.

The Editorial Board has also made plans for a number of special issues that we believe will provide much thought-provoking reading.

Foreign nationals subscribing from nations not in the dollar zone will continue to pay at the present rate; Canadian rates will be the same as U.S. rates. Student subscriptions sent to school addresses will be \$3.00.

The Editors

South Africa, 1959

ALAN PATON

UNTIL GENERAL SMUTS was defeated by Dr. Malan and his Nationalists in 1948, white South Africa practiced a policy of loose racial segregation. Under former Prime Ministers Malan and Strijdom, the policy became a much more clearly defined one of white supremacy and rigid *apartheid*: a flood of racial laws—dealing with residence, ownership, marriage, education, franchise, movement and association—set out to determine one's life from the cradle to the grave, although the idealistic supporters of the Government preferred to call it a policy of separate development. Now Dr. Verwoerd, who became Prime Minister in 1958, has taken up the policy of separate development with enthusiasm.

How does one explain these changes? Why were they made? Are they real or make-believe? There are three important reasons why Dr. Verwoerd has announced a new and vigorous policy of separate development for the "native reserves," those areas long ago set aside for the conquered tribes, which have for many years provided the unskilled labor for the mines and industries of South Africa.

The first reason is that *apartheid* has acquired an evil and world-wide reputation. The Group Areas Act, the Native Urban Areas Act, and the Population Registration Act are all cruel laws. The Government is committed to a policy of racial separation and appears to be indifferent to the sufferings—mainly of non-white persons—that are caused thereby. It is this indifference that has angered the outside world, particularly the non-white world. Such anger must be taken note of. The memory of the indignities that have been afflicted upon the black people in "white areas" must now be wiped out by the development of "black areas" and the granting to them of a new and higher status.

At the last meeting of the United Nations, the number of nations choosing to regard *apartheid* as a domestic affair dropped to five: Britain, Australia, France, Belgium, Portugal. It is because of this growing world disapproval that Dr. Verwoerd has brought forward his new policy of separate development (called locally the Bantustan policy, an analogy with the Pakistan-Hindustan partition). White South Africa dislikes world opinion, but it dislikes world disapproval more. Separate develop-

ment is therefore a policy designed to prove that *apartheid* brings benefits, not hardships; it seeks to justify restrictions here by promoting freedoms yonder.

A second reason for this policy change is, of course, the awakening of Africa to the north of us. Ghana is independent, Nigeria will be independent in 1960, de Gaulle's Africa is independent, Nyasaland is fighting for an independence divorced from that of the Central African Federation. Nearer home, Basutoland, a British-enclave in the self-ruling Union of South Africa, is being given responsible government. Independence is in the air, and separate development is designed to enable Dr. Verwoerd to claim that the "reserves" are getting something like independence too; in fact, he has already done so.

A third reason for this policy change is the growing disquiet among Afrikaner Nationalists themselves, particularly among some of the clergy and laymen of the Dutch Reformed Churches, and some of the scholars of SABRA (the South African Bureau of Racial Affairs, the Afrikaans-speaking counterpart of the English-speaking South African Institute of Race Relations). They, too, are revolted by an *apartheid* that promises group benefits of peace and harmony and yet is so indifferent towards persons.

But more than that, they are calling for the "positive" implementation of *apartheid*; they argue that if *apartheid* means separate development it means a separate development *towards some kind of adulthood*. They are in fact rebelling against the white supremacy of Malan and Strijdom.

So Dr. Verwoerd has announced a new deal in deference to these pressures. How new is the deal? How sincere is it? These are the questions that we need to ask.

Apartheid, the "Pipe-Dream"

Dr. B. B. Keet, respected Christian theologian of Stellenbosch University, calls *apartheid* the "pipe-dream." A pipe-dream is a fantasy that is indulged in when all the facts are against one, when one flies in the face of reason, when the obstacles are insuperable. It does not change reality; it makes it bearable. It is precisely when one is in danger of admitting that the fantasy has no relation to reality, that one hastens to dream it again.

Are our rulers deceiving themselves with the pol-

Mr. Paton, who perhaps is best known for his moving novel, *Cry the Beloved Country*, is an outstanding leader in the campaign for multi-racial democracy in the Union of South Africa.

icy of separate development, or are they trying to deceive others? I think that the answer is a qualified "Yes" in both cases.

Here is the Government, pilloried by world opinion, questioned anxiously (largely in private) by its own supporters, menaced by massive continental events. To shout out "white supremacy" and "*apartheid*" under such circumstances seems foolish; therefore, the new cry, designed to meet all three challenges, is "separate development."

This new emphasis is shown even in the titling of laws: whereas the Group Areas Act, the Population Registration Act and the Registration of Separate Voters' Act all emphasized separation, the proposed new laws, the Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Bill and the Bantu Investment Corporation Bill, emphasize development. This is even more noticeable since the title of the Separate Universities Education Bill, designed to establish separate, inferior, non-white university institutions under strict government control and with none of the traditional university freedoms, was changed to read "Extension of University Education Bill."

As one of the first steps in the implementation of this "positive" policy, the Government intends to take certain "negative" measures which it seems psychologically unable to avoid. It intends, as a step towards implementing separate self-government, to abolish the existing "native representatives," three white persons in the lower house and four in the upper, who are the sole representatives of African interests in the central Parliament. As a step towards establishing separate Bantu colleges, it intends to remove the right of the Universities of Cape Town and the Witwatersrand to admit non-white students. Already, as a step towards establishing separate race areas, it has refused to allow the Durban International Club, which is on an Indian area, to admit persons of other races.

I could quote almost indefinitely and show how these new "constructive" measures always require these preliminary "destructive" steps, the real value of which is, in a changing Africa, baffling to comprehend. For what purpose can this rigid shutting off of person from person, of student from student, even of worshipper from worshipper, serve in the emergent Africa in which, please God, we shall have to live together?

Of course it is claimed that the real and lofty purpose is to make it possible for all our races to pursue their own independent but harmonious courses, each along its own lines. But many of us believe that abhorrence of interracial relations is the real motive; and if that is true, it is little won-

der that *apartheid* is hated throughout the length and breadth of Africa.

The Tomlinson Commission, set up to investigate the development of the "reserves," asked for £100,000,000 over ten years; so far the Government has set aside in three years the sum of £4,000,000. Harry Oppenheimer, in a brilliant speech in Parliament, estimated that £1,000,000,000 was nearer the amount required, but Dr. Verwoerd has stated that £9,000,000 will be enough, and his Government has now set aside the pitiful sum of £500,000 as its first payment to the Bantu Investment Corporation.

Where will this money come from for separate development? South Africa is being compelled more and more to finance its ordinary development from its own resources; but a country where the average income of all people is £120 per annum is in no state to find additional money for an investment that offers so little in return.

Where will the land come from? At the moment, the African people (nearly seventy per cent of the nation) are confined to some twelve per cent of the land and are being deprived of all freehold land that they were able, with humble thrift, to buy in "white" areas. And what is more, this twelve per cent of land contains no ports, no railways of consequence, no mineral wealth. Up till now its only important export has been its labor.

New Dress, Old Song

Separate development is *apartheid* in a new dress. I once likened the Nationalists to a choir of girls in the front row of which, in their clean white dresses, are the separate developers and in



the back row of which, sullen and dirty, are the white supremacists. The front row smiles and bows, but it is the back row that sings the song.

That is still the case. But now the girls in the back row have been ordered to freshen up their dresses, too.

The Nationalist Government hopes to buy time with separate development, not because it will do anything important with time but because it wants to stay alive. For a comparatively small sum each year, it can put up striking new buildings in the "reserves," create new posts, construct new highways. This is what will happen now.

I am not blind to the fact that separate development will offer to some Africans opportunities they would never get in our present society, but that will be the price of accepting a new society that can never be anything but inferior. *Apartheid* can sometimes be a giving of something that is better, but it is always a withholding of everything that is best.

We are one people, whether we like it or not. Our rulers first failed to make our society a place where African aspirations could be realized. Having failed, they now wish to create a separate society where Africans can aspire to heaven itself. But separate development is too late; we have not enough time, not enough money, not enough land for it. Most important of all, what noteworthy African here, with the drums of freedom sounding in his ears, wants to be pushed off now into a Bantustan, poor in resources and deficient in opportunities?

Separate development comes too late, the cry of penitence when the avenger knocks on the door. If it has idealism, that is because it is using idealism for its own unworthy ends. If idealists complain, they are given the reassuring pipe to smoke; and many of them are eager to smoke it, for it is the pipe alone that can make the betrayal of idealism look like a triumph.

This is a picture of a fear-ridden society. The reader will have no doubt of that. And of course he will ask what hope is there for it? He will ask no doubt, what hope for those 3,000,000 of your 15,000,000 who are white?

One must reply that if they are intent solely on preserving their dominant position, there is no hope for them at all. But if they welcome the liberation of African people from century-old bonds of voicelessness and rightlessness, if they are prepared to live in South Africa on the same terms as anyone else and to help build a new country of hope and opportunity for all, there will not only be a place for them but a function for them to fulfill and what is more, a function essential to a

society that is already modern in part, but which desires to modernize itself completely.

To take this non-racial view of South Africa might seem to the outside reader to be virtuous; yet to many Nationalists it is a kind of treachery. Indeed, in December 1956, 156 persons were charged with high treason and presumably with conspiring to overthrow the present regime and to substitute a new society; and it should be noted that this was to be a non-racial society. Mr. Strijdom never hesitated to describe disloyalty to *apartheid* as treachery; and hundreds of thousands of Nationalists, having put their rule beyond the reach of parliamentary and constitutional assault, regard it as traitorous to discuss extraparliamentary activity.

(Of the 156 arrested, twenty-eight months ago, sixty were released after a preparatory examination lasting nearly a year. The indictment of the remaining ninety was challenged by the defense and finally withdrawn in 1958. Thirty of the ninety are now being tried separately from the others, but even their indictment has not been as yet finally formulated, and their trial is not expected to begin before May 1959. The prosecution has had a stormy passage, having been opposed by one of the most brilliant defense teams ever assembled in South Africa. This was made possible by the Treason Trials Defense Fund, whose trustees are Bishop Reeves of Johannesburg, Dr. Ellen Hellman, one-time President of the S.A. Institute of Race Relations, ex-Judge Frank Lucas, formerly judge of the Transvaal Supreme Court and myself. This Fund has received help from Britain and the United States, but it needs more. Its objects are twofold: first to care for dependents, second to maintain the principle of the innocence of unconvicted persons.)

Christians and White Supremacy

The great power of the Government, and the elevation of *apartheid* to the supreme good, has had a bad influence on white Christians. It is well-known, of course, that the three Dutch Reformed Churches are supporters of *apartheid* and find *apartheid* and Christianity quite compatible. They would be angered by the suggestion that *apartheid* has become the supreme good and would reply that it is merely the *means* by which justice, love and truth are to be realized. Yet that can hardly be so; for it is not the great word of justice but the slogan of *apartheid* that stirs the Nationalist blood and inspires the vast majority of their speeches.

But English-speaking Christianity is also deeply corrupted. Many of its leaders are brave and outspoken, but the bulk of the laity is white South African before it is anything else. I do not think I exaggerate when I say that they believe in racial separation by law, but if a man's property is to be taken from him or if he is to be excluded from certain occupations, they would like this to be done in as Christian a way as possible.

The great number of new non-white sects (well over a thousand in number) is proof of a desire to be independent of white Christianity for whatever reason. There are, however, great numbers of non-white Roman Catholics, Anglicans, Methodists and others; many of them are humble people, but a growing number question the overwhelming white leadership of the churches.

In the Union, for example, all the bishops of the Anglican Church are white. The Christian Church in the whole of Africa, but especially in South and Central Africa, faces a great challenge, not that of Islam or communism but that of a Christianity debased by power, privilege and possession. White Christianity in South and Central Africa has always tended to identify itself with the white cause, not the Christian cause.

A much greater measure of identification, both of Christian with Christian and of man with man, is needed if the massive evolution ahead of us is to have some direction and coherence. White South Africa needs a much deeper and more sympathetic understanding of the new forces at work; it must adapt itself to them, not resist them. For if liberation of African life and talent is forced on white South Africans from outside, they will find neither place nor function in the new country. They must recognize clearly that separate development is only *apartheid* in a new dress, a gift forced from an unwilling hand, evoking none of the gratitude for which they no doubt hope and in terms of which they far too often think.

That is why white people like myself welcome the questioning of Afrikaners and hope that the new dress will not distract attention from the old song. What is needed in South Africa today is not a new name for an old habit of thought and action, but a new deal altogether, a new recognition of the non-white people of our country as our fellow-citizens and our fellow-builders of the future.

What hope there would be for us if an increasing number of Afrikaners, realizing at last that *apartheid* by whatever name can never be just, gave their great energy and gifts to the task of preparing for a society that will be common to us all!

ETC.

**Minutes of the Meeting of the
Hebrew Committee
on Relations with Other Nations,
January 6, 800 B.C.**

Chairman: Our principal business today is consideration of a draft statement on war and peace by Mr. Isaiah. Since the statement was delivered to you by runners in advance of this meeting, let us assume that all of us have read it. If there is no objection, we will first have comments on the statement as a whole and then consider it word by word. Are there general comments?

Mr. Benjamin: The statement is too long. The olive growers in our synagogue won't even look at a statement as long as this.

Mr. Judah: In the first paragraph, where it says: "They shall beat their spears into pruning hooks and their swords into ploughshares," what about sling shots? Shouldn't they be included?

Chairman: How would you word the addition?

Mr. Judah: Well, the sling shots could be made into children's toys.

Chairman: Will the secretary read what he has down on that?

Secretary: They shall beat their spears into pruning hooks and their swords into ploughshares and the sling shots shall be given to children to play with.

Mr. Jonathan: Third paragraph, line two: "Nation shall not, etc." Are we in a position to make such a positive statement? Making the final decision is not the function of this committee.

Mr. Jehu: I agree. I suggest the following reading: "In our opinion, nation should not lift up sword against nation or study war any more."

Chairman: All in favor of this change will say "Aye."

Mr. Samuels: Before we vote on that, I feel the lack in this statement of any motivation. Who are we? And why are we saying anything at all on this subject? I don't know quite how to word it but there ought to be something about our basic Hebrew motives and objectives.

Chairman: I see Mr. Judah has been busy writing. Do you have a wording for this addition?

Mr. Judah: How about this? "As Hebrews and guardians of the law given at Sinai, it is our opinion, etc."

Mr. Jonathan: That sounds presumptuous. We are not the only Hebrews and guardians of the law. We have no right to speak for everybody.

Mr. Judah: You are probably right. How about this? "As the Committee on Relations with Other Nations, and as one one-thousandth of one per cent of the guardians of the law, and speaking only for ourselves, we are on the whole of the opinion, etc."

Mr. Benjamin: I'm not quite satisfied with the reference to pruning hooks. Let's be realistic. If all the spears in the country were turned into pruning hooks, we'd have more pruning hooks than we'd know what to do with.

MAY 18 AM 8:10
Mr. Jehu: Mr. Chairman, I move that a subcommittee be appointed to re-draft Mr. Isaiah's statement, taking into account the suggestions made here, and that we meet again after the new moon to consider the revision.

Mr. Eliphaz: I hope the subcommittee will take into consideration that the comma in the third line from the top ought to be a semi-colon.

Chairman: Thank you very much, gentlemen. I think we all want to thank Mr. Isaiah for his very fine statement. At our next meeting I hope we can come up with something really good.

HERMAN F. REISSIG

Mr. Reissig is a church bureaucrat who has, somehow, managed to retain his sense of humor.

CORRESPONDENCE

Thanks to the Readers

TO THE EDITORS: During the past year, the New York Chapter of Christian Action appealed to the readers of *Christianity and Crisis* to send contributions for the "Crusade for Citizenship to Double the Number of Qualified Negro Voters in the South." This movement is sponsored by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (208 Auburn Ave., N.E., Atlanta, Ga.), of which Dr. Martin Luther King is president.

South Africa Defense Fund

Alan Paton writes on page 66 of the South Africa Defense Fund, its work and its need for support.

Late news reports from South Africa state that the court has quashed the indictment of sixty-one persons on the first day of their trial for treason. The Government may seek to reindict them. Meanwhile a defense-prosecution agreement has postponed the trial of thirty others from May 18 to August 3. However, reports indicate that the legal costs will not, even so, be substantially reduced.

Many of our readers may be interested in contributing to their defense. Checks should be addressed to: South Africa Defense Fund, 4 West 40th St., New York 18, N.Y.

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY
BOOK RECEIVING DEPT
5201 WOODWARD AVE
DETROIT 2 MICH
27462 11-59

It gives me great pleasure to say that the appeal met with generous response; in all, the New York Chapter forwarded for this cause about \$2,300, a great deal of which came from the readers of this periodical. We take this way of expressing our thanks and of passing along the thanks of those concerned with the Crusade for Citizenship.

In the fight to destroy segregation and help rid our democracy of discrimination and injustice, the Conference is in continued need of funds.

ROBERT T. HANDY
New York, N.Y.

A Promise Broken

TO THE EDITORS: Mr. Green's promise ("Two Views of Life and Death," March 30) not to question Catherine Marshall's sincerity is broken, later on, when he refers to the greater honesty of Caitlin Thomas.

It may be—to put it even more bluntly than Mr. Green—that Mrs. Marshall has been kidding herself. But I would hate to be the judge of that. Furthermore, it is distasteful to witness a scholar's display of "greater wisdom" against a widow's reconciliation with grief.

If Mr. Green wants to set us straight about the Christian view of life after death, let him use a different illustration—one, for instance, that can fight back and leaves his superior knowledge about ultimate things at least in question.

BEN J. BROWNE
Seattle, Washington

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion
537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*
ODESSA SOUTHERN ELLIOTT, *Assistant Editor*
M. SEARLE BATES WALDO BEACH AMOS WILDER
ROBERT McAFFEE BROWN F. ERNEST JOHNSON
JOSEPH SITTLER HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
RICHARD T. BAKER J. OSCAR LEE
KENNETH W. THOMPSON WILLIAM LEE MILLER

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HENRY SMITH LEIPER JOHN A. MACKAY
FRANCIS P. MILLER M. M. THOMAS
JOHN BAILLIE WILLIAM F. MAY ROGER L. SHINN
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD

CONTENTS

SOUTH AFRICA, 1959

ALAN PATON

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE
ON HEBREW RELATIONS WITH OTHER NATIONS

HERMAN REISSIG